

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VII, Issue No. VIII

February 2002

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

The 2nd Amendment Does NOT Protect Your Right to Keep and Bear Arms

By Vilmos Levay

As member of the NRA, I am sent, from time to time, Truth About Gun owners polls to fill out and send back to the NRA who, ostensibly, sends the results to my Congressman and two Senators. This is fine and dandy, and I certainly appreciate the efforts the good folks in the NRA put in, in my behalf. The questions are rather straightforward (or so I thought until now), and the answers are conveniently arranged in a "Yes", "No", or "Unsure" multiple-choice format.

This time, though, reading question #9, I came to a screeching halt upon discovering the nature of its subtle, almost unnoticeable ambiguity. Question #9 asked:

"Do you believe the Second Amendment to the Constitution protects your personal right to own and use firearms?"

Now some readers will say that the answer to that is an obvious "Yes", to which I reply with an unqualified, resounding "No!"

Neither the Second Amendment to the Constitution, nor any other of the Amendments to the Constitution, nor can the Constitution itself either "protect", "grant" or "guarantee", as some would claim, ANY of an individual's personal rights as a Sovereign American Citizen.

WHAT? some readers may vocalize in disbelief.

But think about it: the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights it

contains, is nothing more than a piece of paper.

Let's analyze it: Article IX states that "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people".

I ask, then: where therein, or any other section of the Constitution, is there a mention of "protect", "grant" or "guarantee" a right by the Constitution?

Ladies and Gentlemen: it is plain, concise, and quite clear that the Constitution MERELY enumerates the rights of the Citizens, whatever they might be. SOME of these rights are "mentioned", but the unmentioned ones are just as important, of course, as stated. And how do we know what these rights are or who "grants" them, as others would say, to us?

That is also very plain, concise and quite clearly alluded to in the first sentence of the second paragraph of "The Unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America":

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness."

So there you have it. ALL the rights of a Citizen come from his Creator: not the Constitution, not the government, not another man, but God Himself!

Well then, if the Constitution MERELY enumerates the rights, which have now been established as coming from God, who or what protects, or guarantees them? That,

again, is very plain, concise and quite clearly contained in the second sentence of the second paragraph of "The Unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America".

It states, "That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their JUST powers from the consent of the governed."

So there you have it, Ladies and Gentlemen: your right to keep and bear arms is SUPPOSED to be protected, guaranteed, by the Government of the United States of America, and NOT by the Constitution -- as unbelievable as that might seem to some!

Furthermore, question #9, for "reference" purposes, came with the following footnote:

"Fact: Lawyers for the Clinton-Gore Administration recently argued before a federal court that the Second Amendment DOES NOT extend an individual Right to Keep and Bear Arms".

In light of the above analysis, the Clinton-Gore Administration argued CORRECTLY!

Point being that if we go around claiming that the Second Amendment extends, guarantees, protects, etc, an individual Right to Keep and Bear Arms, when all it really does is enumerate it, then WE WILL LOSE THE ARGUMENT AND THE RIGHT WITH IT!

Now you know why I could not, in all honesty, mark the "Yes" box to the afore mentioned question as presented! Maybe I'll mark the "Unsure" box...

Ladies and Gentlemen: think of the Constitution NOT as a document which "protects", or "grants" or "guarantees" rights, but

more in terms of a RESTRAINING ORDER placed upon the Government of the United States of America, in order to keep it from VIOLATING the rights with which we were ALL created, born!

Oh, and by the way: what, exactly, is government? Government is We, the People! So what we have is a restraining order placed on the People, admonishing them to NOT use the vast powers of government to violate the People's rights, by way of [unConstitutional] legislation, regardless of how magnanimous the motive presented. You know: "do it for the children"? The logical conclusion being that it is none other than We, the People who can actually protect and guarantee these rights that we claim to be ours. No one else will, nothing else can.

The third sentence from the second paragraph of "The Unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America" is, in this writer's humble opinion, just as important as, if not graver than, the previous two in "That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the RIGHT of the People (their duty - this author's opinion) to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

Some among the readers may consider that the author might be advocating the overthrow of our government...not at all! Simply quoting the words of those who actually did!

Field Manuals, Anyone?

Are you looking for manuals about Rangers, Seals, Special Forces, Infantry, Armor, Medics, Trucks, Artillery, Airborne, Weapons, Mines, Desert Warfare, Tactics, Vehicles, Special Operations, Aviation, Explosives, Jungle Warfare, Maps, Jeeps, Recon, LLRP?

If so Military Media Inc. sells 'em all, according to its web site.

"Our Mission at Military Media Inc is to provide our customers with the FM's and TM's of our military services. We have manuals in both the printed version, as well as on CD-ROM. The manuals

on CD have been formatted into .pdf files, which can be read with the Acrobat reader that is included on our CD's. The files can be copied to your computer, or accessed from the CD.

"They can be printed, copied to your word processing program, or used in any cut and paste project you might have. Every page, map, and picture has been included from the original manuals. These CD's will make a great addition to a military library, or a great start for a new one. If you have not purchased from us before, download our sample file to see how easy it is to use our CD's. Also, check out our free library" which consists of *The Art of War*, *The Prince*, *Manual of Urban Guerilla* and *Book of Five Rings* in .pdf format.

Military Media, PMB 321
7454 Lancaster Pike
Hockessin, DE 19707
610 268-5077
800 433-6214 (orders)
www.military-media.com

-- East Texas Constitutional Militia

More On Media Bias

A recent study by the Media Research Center (MRC) documents the palpable anti-gun bias of the major television networks in reporting firearm-related news. A study released by the MRC in 2000 examined 653 morning and evening news stories from July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1999, and found that stories advocating gun control on ABC, CBS, CNN, and NBC outpaced those opposing by a ratio of nearly 10 to 1. The recent study examined the same period, and showed that the bias advocating more restrictions on law-abiding gun owners is accompanied by an apparent unwillingness to cover stories that the pro-Second Amendment community would like to see

The lawful, defensive use of firearms by law-abiding citizens is a subject that has also been widely ignored, according to the MRC. Although award-winning criminologist Gary Kleck has estimated that firearms are used as often as 2.5 million times a year for protection, the networks reported such acts only 12 times out of the 653 firearm-related stories covered.

This latest study supports another MRC study released in 1994. The 1994 study focused solely on evening news programs from December 1, 1991, to November 30, 1993, and found that 62% of the 107 stories examined devoted substantially more time to anti-gun arguments than pro-gun. It also found that news commentators who endorsed gun control outnumbered those opposed by nearly 2 to 1, and the anti-gun bias was even more distinct when the story concerned the Brady bill, expanding to 3 to 1 against the pro-Second Amendment view. Of course, advocates of our Right to Keep and Bear Arms have been painfully aware of this institutional bias for years, but as more studies report what we already know to be a problem, perhaps the networks will begin to take notice. If they don't, more and more viewers will desert them for more objective news sources. If you would like more information on the MRC see their web site, www.mrc.org

■ NRA Fax Alert Jan. 26, 2001

Kent State 30 Years Later

Kent State University has purchased a modified version of the M16A2 rifle to be used as an upgrade of the Marlin Camp 9mm rifles currently in use on the campus. The military version of the M16A2 rifle is an automatic weapon. The version issued to the Kent State University Campus Police only shoots one round of ammunition at a time. According to various Ohio college campus security officials, unlike a pistol in which the bullet shoots straight out of the barrel, the bullet spirals when shot through the barrel of an M16 rifle, which may cause more severe damage to a human being and is more likely to ricochet and injure others not in the line of fire.

Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones is opposed to the use of this type of weaponry on our college campuses.

"I feel the use of such weaponry is totally unnecessary on a college campus. Having seen the unrest that has taken place at Kent State University in the past with the May 4th, 1970 shootings in which 4 people were killed, bringing this type of weaponry back to any

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

campus could possibly do more harm than good," states Congresswoman Tubbs Jones.

Most colleges in the 11th District including John Carroll University and Case Western Reserve University do not allow campus security to carry rifles with the exception of Cleveland State University's Campus Police who are fully armed with pistols and have access to shotgun firearms.

-- SOURCE Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones

Ed.: here we have the expert ballistics opinion of a Congresswoman and we can all rest assured the M-16 is unique in that the bullet spirals out of the barrel, as the National Guard was well aware when it killed the Kent State students during the Vietnam war.

Note: The *Beacon Journal* reported Jan. 29, 2001, that the State of Ohio approved a Department of Public Safety request to buy about 150 fully automatic M-16 assault rifles for, among others, university and metropolitan park police.

The \$30,000 Assault Rifle

In 2005 the U.S. Army will be equipped with an assault weapon that could have leapt out of the special-effects department of a movie.

"It's the difference between a bow and arrow and a modern rifle," said Hubert Hopkins, president of the Alliant Tech Systems Integrated Defense Co., the coordinator of a three company team that includes Heckler and Koch and Brashear LP.

The Objective Individual Combat Weapon System, or OICW, as it is called, is being touted as having the potential to revolutionize the way America fights its wars. Besides shooting bullets, the OICW will actually be able to hit targets completely behind barriers.

"It's the closest thing you'll get to bullets going around corners," said Barbara Muldowney, the OICW assistant product manager for the Army's Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.

Along with the standard 5.56-mm projectiles, the OICW will shoot 20-mm explosive rounds containing miniaturized electronics that can detonate the ammunition in midair. That means a soldier shooting the OICW doesn't have to hit his target directly. Instead, he

can cause an explosion behind the target — and behind or above the barrier the target is hiding behind.

A soldier need only make sure the target's in the blast radius, the exact measurement of which is classified. Unless the target is protected by a strong-enough wraparound shield, the OICW will make many obstacles irrelevant.

"Where an enemy sniper can drop behind trees and cover, the soldier lases [uses his laser to target] on a tree, shoots his OICW, and that sniper's gone," Muldowney said.

The OICW has "basically the same architecture" as the M16 assault rifle, but it is "five times as effective at twice the range," Hopkins said.

In simulations, an infantry squad equipped with OICWs was sent into an offensive battle against another squad with standard weapons. Then an infantry squad with standard weapons was sent against a similarly accoutered force. The differences between how the OICW-equipped squad and the regular infantry did were stark, Hopkins said.

In the battle with traditional weapons, both the friendly and the enemy forces had about the same number of dead and wounded. In the OICW scenario, the OICW won the battle with "virtually no casualties," he said.

"You can go after all your targets," Muldowney said. "They can't hide."

Loaded with the 20mm bursting weapon and sophisticated computer-targeting equipment, the OICW weighs 14 lbs., just under the weight of a standard-issue M4 rifle with optical equipment and a thermal-weapons sight.

The program costs about \$32 million a year, and the OICW costs \$30,000 apiece. When the weapon is ready for mass production in three years, the Army will buy up to 25,000 of them at first.

Out of each standard nine-man infantry squad, four soldiers will have the OICW.

Squeaky Clean or Else

PHILADELPHIA (AP) - People the government suspects of terrorist involvement will be arrested on the most minor of crimes - spitting on the sidewalk or petty credit card swindles - just to get them off the

street, a senior Bush administration lawyer said.

"If we suspect you of terrorism you better be squeaky clean," Assistant Attorney General Viet Dinh told an audience of lawyers and human rights advocates, some of whom shook their heads in disagreement.

"If we suspect you of terrorism we will arrest you, no matter how minor the violation, so that you are removed from the street and from the people that you wish to harm," Dinh told an American Bar Association session.

Citing the late Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's campaign to bust organized crime, Dinh said terrorist suspects will be arrested if they "so much as spit on the sidewalk."

Are You a Terrorist?

Here's a simple test to check your moral worthiness and see if you can escape God's - sorry, Bush's - all-devouring wrath. Have you ever gone for a beer and bought a Stella Artois instead of a Bud? Then you, my friend, have engaged in a conspiracy to cause "adverse effects" to the economy of the United States. And that makes you one of the evildoers. So says the great Oval Object in his latest executive order, in which he grants himself the power to have anyone he designates as a terrorist to be tried by secret military tribunals and executed without appeal. Bush's dread edict - which of course takes effect without any input from that useless appendage of a bygone era, the U.S. Congress - covers anyone who "causes, threatens to cause" or even "has as their aim" to cause "adverse effects" on, among other things, the American economy or U.S. foreign policy. As always, Bush alone retains the right [power - Ed.] to decide who is and who is not a terrorist, just as he alone decides what constitutes an "adverse effect" on the U.S. Could be a bomb, a boycott, a protest, a tariff - or the wrong beer; it's his call.

The edict gives him the power to seize any non-U.S. citizen, in any country on Earth, and to subject him or her to secret summary justice. There is no legal recourse for the accused - not even to the laws of their own country.

But what about the malcontents in what Bush now calls "the Homeland"? Hey, we got it

covered. The U.S. government now has the power to prosecute any public expression of dissent as an act of "domestic terrorism," thanks to the super-duper USA PATRIOT Act passed, in the dead of night, by Congress in late October - a law which most of the dangling legislative appendages freely admit they never read before the vote. Under the new law, you are a "domestic terrorist" subject to 25 years in prison, if you engage in acts intended to "influence the policy of government by intimidation or coercion." Which is, of course, the very definition of public protest: the attempt to force policy changes on reluctant governments through an unsettling display of popular will.

In this case, the Imperial Executive has delegated power to his most faithful minion: Attorney General John Ashcroft. It is Ashcroft - the only senator in U.S. history to be rejected by voters in favor of a dead man - who will now define the limits of freedom in America.

-- Moscow, Idaho *Times*

Ed.: HR 3162, P.L. 107-56, titled "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act of 2001" was introduced October 23, 2001, and signed 3 days later

Ashcroft and HCI Agree on Gun Control

Statement Of Sarah Brady On The Confirmation Of John Ashcroft As U.S. Attorney General

-- The following statement was released by Handgun Control Inc.:

"Today, the United States Senate voted to confirm John Ashcroft as Attorney General by a vote of 58-42. While we at Handgun Control are disappointed at the outcome of this vote, we are gratified that the confirmation process highlighted Americans' support for gun safety efforts and raised the importance of enforcement of gun laws -- like the Brady Law and the federal assault weapons ban -- to the forefront of the national discussion.

"During his testimony and in his written responses to questions from the Judiciary Committee, John Ashcroft promised to make the enforcement and defense of our nation's gun laws a top priority.

Specifically, he claimed the following:

-- He believes in closing the gun show loophole.

-- He supports the assault weapons ban and will work for its reauthorization in 2004.

-- He will make keeping guns out of the hands of felons a top priority.

-- He believes that the federal government should have a strong role in the prosecution of illegal firearm trafficking and cracking down on irresponsible dealers.

-- He will vigorously defend gun laws under attack in the courts

-- He will give prosecutors the resources they need to aggressively enforce our gun laws and provide more funding for that enforcement.

"Despite these assertions, we remain concerned about Mr. Ashcroft's true commitment to using the power of his office to reduce gun violence -- and not simply because of his past record of opposing reasonable gun laws."

-- U.S. Newswire, Feb. 1, 2001

Secret Probes of Sept 11

(Washington, DC) Judicial Watch, the public interest law firm that investigates and prosecutes government corruption and abuse, expressed concern and disappointment over press reports that the Bush Administration is trying to restrict Congressional probes of the September 11th attacks to closed session reviews by House and Senate committees of U.S. government anti-terrorism failures.

Analysts believe that much of the Congressional review will focus on intelligence and immigration failures by various civilian and military agencies charged with gathering information on terrorist organization capabilities and intentions. Closed door hearings would preclude the public disclosure of the facts unearthed by the Congressional review, in some cases for decades. While American citizens should not have access to classified information, there should be a public airing of the reasons behind the negligence of both the Clinton-Gore and Bush-Cheney Administrations in not being vigilant before September 11, 2001. In this way, the public can participate in the debate on how to fix the security

failures, stated Judicial Watch Chairman and General Counsel Larry Klayman.

The Bush Administration should also make the best of a dismal situation and clean house at all of the nation's intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Congressional hearings should be about disclosure and accountability, not a small club of intelligence bureaucrats making excuses to each other. If ever there was a time for an honest re-assessment of the nation's intelligence capabilities and operations, this is it, Klayman added.

In a January 27, 2002 *New York Times* magazine interview, Ambassador Alan Keyes echoed Judicial Watch's concern when he stated, ***"On Sept. 11 we witnessed the most egregious failure of America's national security system in our history: Why has no one been held accountable for that failure in your [President George W. Bush] administration?"***

-- Press release January 31, 2002

UN Sex Trafficking?

By Wendy McElroy

Is the United Nation's police force in Bosnia turning a blind eye or, even worse, participating in sex trafficking? It certainly seems that, as this new scandal emerges, the corruption reaches upward into the UN hierarchy.

Last summer, American Kathryn Bolkovac, a former Nebraska policewoman, was fired from the U.N.'s International Police Task Force. Bolkovac claims it was because she spoke out against the United Nation's involvement in sex trafficking. Through interviews with 85 women coerced into sex, Bolkovac learned that U.N. officers were not only using the women for sex but also seemed to be active in the business end, for example, the forging of documents to transport young girls across national borders.

The young girls are from desperately poor nations like Romania. Many reportedly answer ads for "legitimate" work only to be kidnapped, taken across borders and enslaved in brothels that operate with the full knowledge of the local authorities.

After Bolkovac advised various U.N. officials about the sex ring, IPTF Deputy Commissioner Mike Stiers decided that Bolkovac

2002

was psychologically worn out. Although an extension of her contract had been recommended prior to the e-mail, she was transferred to a suburb of Sarajevo, and then fired. Bolkovac stated, "Those responsible ... did not want to hear about this."

Douglas Coffman, a spokesman for the United Nations in Sarajevo, denied the accusation, but Bolkovac is not the first to hurl it. Stories of U.N. corruption were already appearing in the European press. David Lamb, a former Philadelphia policeman working as a U.N. human rights investigator in central Bosnia, leveled even more serious charges. He provided evidence that IPTF members were directly linked to forcing girls into prostitution. Most prominently, he named two Romanian officers who sold women directly to brothels. Lamb filed his findings. He found that "the opposition of the central [U.N.] Mission Headquarters was unbelievable."

The *Washington Post* reported on what happened next. "The United Nations quashed an investigation ... into whether U.N. police were directly involved in the enslavement of Eastern European women in Bosnian brothels, according to U.N. officials and internal documents."

U.N. officials do not admit that anything is amiss. When asked about Lamb's allegations against the Romanian officers, Jacques Klein the U.N. secretary general's special representative to Bosnia declared, "I have absolutely no evidence, no record, and I'm unaware of any internal investigation into any alleged misconduct involving a Romanian police monitor."

A few weeks later, confidential U.N. documents revealed that Lamb had notified several U.N. officials about the two Romanians. Moreover, after Lamb departed, a Canadian officer, the Romanian government and an anti-corruption unit of the United Nations investigated the case in turn. Rosario Ioanna, the Canadian, issued a report similar to Lamb's, complaining that local U.N. authorities tried to close down the investigation. Yet the United Nations refuses to allow the Romanian policemen to be interviewed.

Subsequent U.N. investigations appear to be cosmetic. For example, an inquiry

was instigated but, according to the *Post*, investigators didn't bother to contact Lamb or other whistleblowers. Not surprisingly, the inquiry found insufficient grounds to probe further.

The character revealed by the United Nations in Bosnia is particularly significant today. The agency is pushing hard to become a global government. In March, the U.N.'s High Level Panel of Financing Development will meet in Mexico and endorse recommendations that are expected to include: a World Taxing Authority, global taxes on fossil fuel and/or on all currency exchange and U.N. supervision of all international finance.

As the United Nations pushes for jurisdiction over the globe, it is important to remember how it has acted in Bosnia. The character of an institution, no less than of an individual, is revealed through actions, not words. It is revealed in the small behaviors such as the willingness to watch or participate in the selling of young girls into the living hell of Bosnian brothels.

The U.S. is the most powerful force opposing the United Nations. If America refuses to meet U.N. demands, and, as yet, the U.S. has not even paid its U.N. fees then worldwide government will fail. If U.N. policy in Bosnia is a microcosm of what globalization would look like, then an autonomous and dissenting U.S. becomes the hope of the world.

Gunman Says Sound of New Jersey Made Him Snap

GALVESTON (Reuters) - A Texas jury found Thomas Mitchell guilty of aggravated assault for shooting his girlfriend because he thought she was about to say the words "New Jersey."

His attorney unsuccessfully sought his exoneration on grounds that certain words set off an uncontrollable rage in Mitchell, who has a history of mental illness. Words that triggered a bad reaction in Mitchell included "New Jersey," "Wisconsin," "Snickers" and "Mars," lawyer Maria Mercado told the court. witnesses used flashcards with the words written out instead of saying them in court.

"When he has one of these episodes, he isn't focused," lawyer Mercado said.

"Smart Guns" for Cops - If It Saves Only One Child...

PHILADELPHIA (AP) -- A 10-year-old boy was grazed in the right cheek by a bullet when an off-duty police officer conducting a school demonstration dropped her gun.

The boy was released after treatment at Temple University Children's Medical Center, hospital spokeswoman Jennifer McGowan said.

The officer had shown the magazine clip to the class at Imani Education Circle Charter School and had just put it back in the gun when she dropped the weapon.

Police department spokesman Sgt. Roland Lee declined to name the officer who joined the department in 1996. Her child was among the 23 students in the class at the time, he said.

GAO Says FBI Agents Faked Vouchers

WASHINGTON (AP) - FBI agents spent more than \$1,800 in government money to come to a retirement dinner for a demoted top official instead of attending a Quantico, Va., training session, according to government investigators. The agents will repay the money, the FBI said.

The General Accounting Office had been asked by Senate Judiciary Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., and Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, to look into how many FBI agents submitted fake vouchers for travel expenses to attend a 1997 retirement party for a deputy director.

Eight FBI employees, including the training division's assistant director and section chief, were investigated after about 140 people attended the retirement party for former Deputy FBI Director Larry Potts on Oct. 9, 1997, in Arlington, Va., near Washington.

Potts was investigated by the Justice Department for allegations of covering up his role in the Ruby Ridge siege and shootings, particularly in drawing up the rules of engagement for the snipers. He was demoted, but left the government before decisions were reached on whether to impose administrative discipline.

Letters

Gentlemen,

"A Critique of the Militia" (*NJM Newsletter* Dec. 2001) made several valid points. However the problems in some units are not consistent throughout the United States. Each state has its own political structure and population base. The formulas for a solution have been as varied as the branch and years of service that its men have served in.

For years up until the present I have sat down with men who organized everything from fire teams and squads up to state organizations. We looked at everything from maintaining national transportation to who can produce and maintain combat boots at the local level.

The first consideration has been the size of the AO (area of operation). The 13 colonies, as we know, were spread out over a vast area. The militia quality of that day was no different from the militia quality of 1812, 1860, 1898 or today. In 1775 there were units armed with state of the art weapons with a matching education in use and warfare doctrine of that day. At the other end of the spectrum were small formations of militia organized by township or village, and lacking weapons, powder, shot, food and logistical support for projecting themselves outside of their AO.

The strategic AO of our modern militia entails 50 states and has extensive support in western and central Canada. (Why do you think the Soviets in Canada have a gun grab with the BATF?)

We must become better at what we are training to do. However with irregular or unconventional forces "consistency kills." If we create one standard pattern for operations and training our activities become predictable. From the other side intelligence analysis can come up with solutions to more easily fix, fight and destroy a consistent series of units in the field. Flexibility in organization is what works best with

the assets that we have on hand, or build ourselves, as we develop the order of battle on our terms.

We are irregular forces. Private armoured vehicles, fast attack vehicles such as jeeps, trucks and dune buggies make our units light mechanized and as mobile as the aggressor in many areas. Many squad, platoon and company strength units have predeployed fuel, spare parts and POL (petroleum, oils and lubricants) support where it needs to be. Large central depots become bomb magnets or are subject to confiscation by UN operatives. Somalia is the best example with Rangers being used as BAT FAGOTS (BATF) to confiscate arms in a country we had no business being in. What you saw there is what they were practicing to do here.

I also strongly agree with the author that you need to walk the battlefields of the past and go one step farther, walk the battlefield of the near future, your community, your country, your state. Take a different route everywhere you go. If you can walk do so as it serves two purposes. One, it's good exercise and we can all use that. Two, it allows you to place in memory your personal AO. As in any war local scouts with good working knowledge of the area are priceless.

By taking different routes you will note important changes such as bridge construction or failure to replace bridges intentionally.

It is very important that mapping be done. Remember, your mind is your first best weapon and tool. Learn the mapping systems that are available and make notations where they are incorrect such as missing bridges. You can control the maps but the other side controls GPS, which will be shut down when the time comes. Also your maps require no batteries. (At the U.S. Army Intel Center and School the first week was map reading 101. If you did not pass you

went no further. Period.)

You as a militia member or militia commander must learn as much as you can from past military actions. Here in Michigan in the War of 1812 militia with little or no help from the regulars gave America some of the few victories during the first year. A campaign in Ontario resulted in the destruction of several British expeditionary forces.

There is much more that I would like to say and will in future letters. We are a resource rich nation both in raw and fabricated material. Solutions will be found for all of our problems but you the reader must be the one to find them.

I will close with this. There were many who called the men who stood with the militia in 1777 "lunatics and wierdos." Most of the "professional" and "rational" people went home. The "crazy" ones that didn't know better (I would have been in that bunch) stayed. There really was no extended plan when on 19 April 1775 the UN, oh I'm sorry, the "Sun Never Sets on the British Empire," troops came to confiscate and burn, but we went ahead anyway. Our militia had to fight with what it had. The basic building blocks were there. I do not think it will be any different this time around. We have a big country to keep free of UN occupation. We have a lot of work ahead of us. The time to prepare is here. Do what needs to be done and do it right.

Mark Gregory: Koernke
G.D.W!

Michigan State Prisoner

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

militia264@aol.com

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____